



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/845,785 | 04/30/2001 | Karen P. Parnell | 005306.P019 | 4346 |
| 60975 | 7590 | 03/06/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| CSA LLP 4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD. BLDG. 4, SUITE 201 AUSTIN, TX 78759 | | | SPOONER, LAMONT M | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2626 | |

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|----------------------------------------|------------|---------------|
| 3 MONTHS | 03/06/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/845,785 | PARNELL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Lamont M. Spooner | 2626 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,5,9,16-19,22,26,33,34 and 38-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5,9,16-19,22,26,33,34 and 38-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 10/30/06, with respect to the 35 USC 112 rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous 35 USC 112 rejections of the claims, and claim objections have been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the 35 USC 103 rejections claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, based on the amendment.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33, 34, and 38-43, drawn to Multilingual or national language support, classified in class 704, subclass 8.

II. Claim 44, drawn to partial language translation, classified in class 704, subclass 5.

3. Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct

if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination II has separate utility such as partial sectional/partial translation. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. Newly submitted claim 44 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Claim 44 is directed towards partial translation, class 704, subclass 5.

6. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 44 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 16-19, 22, 26, 33 and 34 and 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (hereinafter referred to as Lee, US 6,442,516) in view of Rojas et al. (hereinafter referred to as Rojas, US 6,425,123), and further in view of Malcolm (US 5,416,903).

Lee, Rojas and Malcolm are analogous art in that they both involve the development process of software.

As per **claims 1, 18 and 34**, Lee discloses a method facilitating a polylingual simultaneous shipment of the application, the method comprising:

developing a base version of the application in a base language (C.2.lines 57-67, C.6.lines 27-34), wherein the language dependant code is maintained separately from language independent code of the base version of the application (C.4.lines 8-17-language dependent code tracked from language independent code not requiring translation in a base language, having a library control feature translatable components only in these fields, i.e. his available field of database... translation, and library control database that tracks all changes to the language source file that would require a translation);

facilitating an internationalization (I18N) of the base version of the application concurrent with the developing of the base version of the application (C.3.lines 56-63, C.4.lines 58-64); and

facilitating a L10N of the base version of the application concurrent with the internationalization (C.3.lines 59-61), wherein the L10N comprises

generating a base glossary for the language dependent code, the base glossary being translated into at least one language different from the base language (C.3.lines 56-57, C.10.lines 10-16, the L10N process, C.10.line 58-C.11.line 39, C.10.lines 58-60-his seeds as the base glossary, C.3.line 67-C.4.line 1, 14-16, C.11.lines 5-9, 13-15-translated files include a base glossary).

but lacks disclosing facilitating an I18N of the base version of the application, wherein the I18N process comprises pseudo localization (L10N) of the language dependent code of the base version of the application;

However, Rojas teaches having an I18N process including a pseudo L10N of the language dependent code of the base version of the application (C.2.line 48-C.3.line 5). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Lee with Rojas by implementing a mock L10N. The motivation for doing so would have been to test language translatability in computer software (C.2.lines 45-47).

Lee and Rojas lack facilitating a localization of the base version of the application concurrent with the internationalization of the base version of

the application. However, Malcolm teaches this lacking element (C.10.lines 16-30). Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify Lee and Rojas with the concurrent (parallel) localization and internationalization, for the benefit of reducing overall time requirements for development (C.10.lines 25-27).

As per **claims 2, and 19**, Lee in view of Rojas disclose all the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 2 depends. Rojas further discloses developing the base version of the application comprises:

identifying all language-dependent user interface code (C.4.lines 34-45); and

creating a source code structure for the application wherein the language-dependent user interface code is maintained separately from non user interface code (C.4.lines 35-37-separate executable program).

As per **claims 5 and 22**, Lee in view of Rojas disclose all the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 5 depends. Lee further discloses: the base language is English (C.6.lines 30-34).

As per **claims 9 and 26**, Lee in view of Rojas disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 9 depends.

Rojas also teaches pseudo L10N includes adding a prefix to each translatable string in the application (C.4.lines 58-67).

As per **claims 16 and 33**, Lee in view of Rojas disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, upon which claim 16 depends. Lee further discloses the at least one language different from the base language is selected from the group consisting of: German, Spanish, French, Japanese, Danish, Dutch, Italian, Portuguese, Swedish, Chinese, Korean, Czech, Finnish, Greek, and Hebrew (C.10.lines 10-15-French, C.11.lines 45-47).

As per **claim 17**, Lee and Rojas disclose dependent claim 1, Rojas further teaches wherein the application (C.2.lines 40-44) comprises a front end (C.4.lines 45, 46-required as a front end development), a middle (C.4.lines 33-45), and a data model (C.4.lines 46-52-data model), wherein the front end comprises user interface code developed in a base language (C.4.lines 34-45, 53, 54-base language interface code required to initiate the process), and the middle comprises non user interface code developed in a programming language (C.4.lines 35-37-separate executable program follows the initiated front end);

As per **claim 38**, Lee and Rojas disclose dependent claim 1, and Lee further teaches a first portion of the language dependent code is stored in a master repository (C.2.lines 62-66-his all files logged in the library control database as the first portion) and a second portion of the language dependent code is stored in resource files (C.4.lines 8-15-his baselevel fields as the second portion ...resource files).

As per **claim 39**, Lee and Rojas teach claim 1, Lee further teaches the internationalization further comprises identifying defects in a previous version of the application (C.4.lines 18-23-his “translated file downlevel” interpreted as defects, wherein they necessarily are modified, or fixed, C.4.lines 44-67, also his files that require changes, C.5.lines 39-44-the identified errors from the CMVC).

As per **claims 40 and 41**, Lee and Rojas teach claim 9, Rojas also teaches wherein the pseudo localization further comprises altering locale-specific settings (C.2.lines 48-67-his formatting and hard-coded text for the localization files, C.5.lines 31-37-his mock translation) in an operating environment (C.6.lines 36-48-his hard-coded text, Fig. 5 item 510).

wherein the locale-specific settings comprise at least one of a date, a time, a number, a currency format and a hard-coded reference to a

translation (C.2.lines 48-67-his formatting, and C.6.lines 36-48-his hard-coded text, Fig. 5 item 510).

As per **claim 42**, Lee and Rojas teach claim 9, and Lee further teaches wherein the pseudo localization further comprises identifying hard-coded strings in the application by simulating localization of the application (C.6.lines 37-48, Figs. 4 and 5).

As per **claim 43**, Lee and Rojas teach claim 1, Lee further teaches generating the base glossary comprises creating a list of base language strings (C.10.lines 59, and 60-his sets of files from language objects, the language objects as the base language strings in the CMVC).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ims
2/18/07



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER